

Revised support forcing iterations and the continuum hypothesis

Preliminary report

Chaz Schlindwein

CSC 690, Spring 1996

February 1, 2008

Current address (until June 15):

995 Count Wutzke Av

Las Vegas NV 89119 USA

`chaz@cs.unlv.edu`

After June 15:

Division of Mathematics and Computer Science

Lander University

Greenwood SC 29649 USA

Abstract

In [Sh, chapter XI], Shelah shows that certain revised countable support (RCS) iterations do not add reals. His motivation is to establish the independence (relative to large cardinals) of Avraham's problem on the existence

of uncountable non-constructible sequences all of whose proper initial segments are constructible, Friedman's problem on whether every 2-coloring of $S_0^2 = \{\alpha < \omega_2 : \text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega\}$ has an uncountable sequentially closed homogeneous subset, and existence of a precipitous normal filter on ω_2 with $S_0^2 \in \mathcal{F}$. The posets which Shelah uses in these constructions are Prikry forcing, Namba forcing, and the forcing consisting of closed countable subsets of S^* under reverse end-extension, where S^* is a fixed stationary co-stationary subset of S_0^2 . Shelah establishes different preservation theorems for each of these three posets (the theorem for Namba forcing is particularly intricate). We establish a general preservation theorem for a variant of RCS iterations which includes all three posets in a straightforward way.

Revised countable support (RCS) iterations, introduced by Shelah [Sh, chapter X], is a generalization of the well-known countable support iteration method for forming forcing iterations. RCS iterations are appropriate for semi-proper forcings (e.g., Prikry forcing) and also even for forcing iterations built of posets which cofinalize some regular cardinal to have countable cofinality even if the forcings are not semi-proper (for example, one may use RCS iteration to iterate Namba forcing even in cases where Namba forcing is not semi-proper). The most important fact about RCS iterations is that semi-properness is preserved (i.e., if the constituent posets of the iteration are semi-proper, then the resulting forcing is itself semi-proper). This was established by Shelah [Sh, chapter X]. A simplified version of RCS iterations was introduced in [S] along with a simplified proof of preservation of semi-properness.

A secondary fact about RCS iterations is that certain posets can be iterated without adding reals. For example, roughly speaking, Shelah [Sh, chapter XI] shows that iteration of Prikry forcing, or iteration of Namba forcing over a ground model satisfying CH, does not add reals (regardless of whether Namba forcing is semi-proper). Certain technical restrictions apply in Shelah's results; notably, in the case of Namba forcing certain cardinal collapses must occur, via Levy collapses or other σ -closed cardinal collapses. In this paper we introduce a variant of revised countable support and prove a general preservation theorem for not adding reals in which many of the technical restrictions of Shelah are eliminated.

Notation. Our notation follows [S]. We set M^P equal to the set (or

class) of P -names which are in M . This is different from the class of names whose values are forced to be in M , and it is different from the class of names whose values are forced to be in $M[G_P]$ (of course, for any G and any name $\dot{x}$ which is forced to be in $M[G_P]$ there is $p \in G$ and $\dot{y} \in M^P$ such that $p \Vdash \dot{x} = \dot{y}$). The notation $\dot{P}_{\eta, \alpha}$ is used in the context of a forcing iteration $\langle P_\beta : \beta \leq \kappa \rangle$ based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\beta : \beta < \kappa \rangle$; it denotes a P_η -name characterized by $V[G_{P_\eta}] \models \dot{P}_{\eta, \alpha} = \{p \restriction [\eta, \alpha) : p \restriction \eta \in G_{P_\eta} \text{ and } p \in P_\alpha\}$. Here, $s \restriction [\eta, \alpha)$ is not the check (with respect to P_η) of the restriction of s to the interval $[\eta, \alpha)$, but rather it is a P_η -name for the function f with domain equal to $[\check{\eta}, \check{\alpha})$ such that $f(\check{\beta})$ is the P_η -name for the $\dot{P}_{\eta, \beta}$ -name corresponding to the P_β -name $s(\beta)$. This may be contrasted with the definition of [B, page 23]. We shall use such facts as $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \dot{P}_{\eta, \alpha} \text{ is a poset;}$ see [S] for a proof. By “ $\text{supt}(p)$ ” we mean $\{\beta \in \text{dom}(p) : p \restriction \beta \Vdash p(\beta) = \mathbf{1}\}$. Notice that a stronger condition may have a support which is not a superset of a weaker condition.

The following definition should be compared to [S 2, definition 1].

Definition 1. Suppose that $\langle P_\eta : \eta < \alpha \rangle$ is a forcing iteration. We define $Rlim^*(P_\eta : \eta < \alpha)$. Let $\tilde{P}_\alpha$ be the inverse limit of this sequence. We set $P_\alpha = Rlim^*(P_\eta : \eta < \alpha) = \{p \in \tilde{P}_\alpha : (\forall q \leq_{\tilde{P}_\alpha} p)(\forall \eta < \alpha)(\forall \dot{\beta} \in V^{P_\eta})(\exists \zeta < \alpha)(\exists r \leq q \restriction \zeta)(r \restriction \eta = q \restriction \eta \text{ and } r \Vdash \text{“if } \zeta < \dot{\beta} \leq \alpha \text{ then either } \text{cf}(\dot{\beta}) = \omega \text{ or } \text{supt}(p \restriction [\zeta, \dot{\beta})) \text{ is empty”})\}$.

If $P_\eta = Rlim^*(P_\xi : \xi < \eta)$ for every limit η , then we say that $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \alpha \rangle$ is an RCS^* -iteration.

Notice that RCS^* -iterations are forcing iterations in the sense of [B], [S]. Thus we can use the results of [S, section 3] to justify the usual abuses of

notation which are used in treatments of forcing iterations.

Definition 2. Suppose P is a poset and λ is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and μ is a cardinal (we allow $\mu = 2$) and $\{P, \mu\} \subseteq M \prec H_\lambda$ and $|M| = \aleph_0$. Then we say that r is (M, μ) -pseudo-complete iff whenever $\sigma \in M^P$ then there is $\gamma \in M \cap \mu$ such that $r \Vdash \text{“}\sigma \in \check{\mu} \text{ implies } \sigma = \check{\gamma} \text{”}$.

Definition 3. P is μ -pseudo-complete iff whenever $\{P, \mu\} \subseteq M \prec H_\lambda$ and $|M| = \aleph_0$ and $p \in P \cap M$, then there is $q \leq p$ such that q is (M, μ) -pseudo-complete.

Lemma 4. Suppose P is μ -pseudo-complete and G is a V -generic filter over P . Then $({}^\omega \mu)^V = ({}^\omega \mu)^{V[G]}$.

Proof: Immediate.

Definition 5. Suppose P is a μ -pseudo-complete poset and $\dot{Q}$ is a P -name for a poset. We say that $\dot{Q}$ is μ -pseudo-complete relative to P iff whenever λ is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and $\{P * \dot{Q}, \mu\} \subseteq M \prec H_\lambda$ and $|M| = \aleph_0$ and $p = (p_0, \dot{p}_1) \in P * \dot{Q} \cap M$ then there is $q = (q_0, \dot{q}_1) \leq p$ such that q_0 is (M, μ) -pseudo-complete and whenever $\sigma \in M^{P * \dot{Q}}$ there is $\tau \in M^P$ such that $q_0 \Vdash \text{“}\dot{q}_1 \Vdash \text{‘}\sigma \in \check{\mu} \text{ implies } \sigma = \check{\tau} \text{’”}$.

Notice that the hypothesis on σ and $\dot{p}_1$ is stronger than requiring them to be in $M[G_P]$, and it is different from requiring them to be in $\check{M}$. Similarly the conclusion does not imply that $\tau \in M[G_P]$ nor that $\tau \in \check{M}$.

Definition 6. We say P_α is strictly μ -pseudo-complete iff whenever λ is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and $\{P_\alpha, \mu\} \subseteq M \prec H_\lambda$ and $|M| = \aleph_0$ and

$\eta \in \alpha \cap M$ and $p \in P_\alpha \cap M$ and $q \leq p \restriction \eta$ and q is (M, μ) -pseudo-complete then there is $r \leq p$ such that $r \restriction \eta = q$ and r is (M, μ) -pseudo-complete.

Lemma 7. Suppose P_α is strictly μ -pseudo-complete. Then P_α is μ -pseudo-complete.

Proof: Obvious (take $\eta = 0$ in definition 6).

Definition 8. We say that the forcing iteration $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ is uniform iff $(\forall \alpha \leq \kappa)((\exists \gamma < \alpha)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \text{“cf}(\alpha) \leq \omega\text{”}) \text{ or } (\forall \gamma < \alpha)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \text{“cf}(\alpha) > \omega\text{”}))$.

The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 9. Suppose $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a uniform RCS^* -iteration and suppose $(\forall \eta < \kappa)(\dot{Q}$ is μ -pseudo-complete relative to $P_\eta)$. Then P_κ is strictly μ -pseudo-complete.

Proof: By induction on κ . Fix M, λ, p, η , and q as in definition 6.

Case 1: κ is a successor ordinal.

Immediate.

Case 2: $\text{cf}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Take $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle \in M$ an increasing sequence cofinal in κ with $\alpha_0 = \eta$. Let $\langle \sigma_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ enumerate M^{P_κ} . Build $\langle r_n, \tau_n, q_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ by recursion such that $q_0 = q$ and $r_0 = p$ and each of the following holds:

(i) $r_{n+1} \leq r_n$ and $r_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = q_n$ and $r_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) \in M^{P_{\alpha_n}}$ and $r_{n+1} \Vdash \text{“}\sigma_n \in \check{\mu} \text{ implies } \sigma_n = \check{\tau}_n\text{”}$

(ii) $q_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = q_n$ and $q_{n+1} \leq r_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_{n+1}$ and q_n is (M, μ) -pseudo-complete.

Now set $r = \bigcup \{q_n : n \in \omega\}$. Clearly this r is as required.

Case 3: $(\forall \gamma < \kappa)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \text{“cf}(\kappa) > \omega\text{”})$

Build $\langle p_n, \tau_n, r_n, \zeta_n, q_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $p_0 = p$ and $r_0 = p$ and $q_0 = q$ and $\zeta_0 = \eta$ and all of the following hold:

- (i) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\zeta_n}} \text{“} p_{n+1} \restriction [\zeta_n, \kappa) \Vdash \sigma_n = \check{\tau}_{n+1} \text{”}$ and $\tau_{n+1} \in M^{P_{\zeta_n}}$ and $p_{n+1} \leq r_n$ and $p_{n+1} \in M$ and $p_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_n = r_n \restriction \zeta_n$
- (ii) $r_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_{n+1} \Vdash \text{“supt}(p_{n+1} \restriction [\zeta_{n+1}, \kappa)) = \emptyset\text{”}$ and $r_{n+1} \leq p_{n+1}$ and $r_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_n = p_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_n$ and $r_{n+1} \in M$ and $\zeta_{n+1} \in M$
- (iii) $q_{n+1} \leq r_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_{n+1}$ and $q_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_n = q_n$ and q_{n+1} is (M, μ) -pseudo-complete

Now take $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $r \restriction \zeta_n = q_n$ for every $n \in \omega$ and $\text{supt}(r) \subseteq \bigcup \{\zeta_n : n \in \omega\}$. It is easy to see that this r witnesses the desired conclusion.

Case 4: $\text{cf}(\kappa) > \omega$ and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta} \text{“cf}(\kappa) = \omega\text{”}$

We may assume $\eta' \in M$. Furthermore, by increasing η if necessary, we may assume $\eta = \eta'$. Let $X = \{\alpha < \kappa : \text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1\}$. Notice that $(\forall \gamma < \kappa)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \text{“cf}(\kappa) \geq \omega_2\text{”})$. This is because if there is some $p' \in P_\gamma$ with $\gamma < \kappa$ and $p' \Vdash \text{“cf}(\kappa) = \omega_1\text{”}$, then we may assume $\gamma \geq \eta$ and therefore we have that $p' \Vdash \text{“}\omega_2 \neq \omega_2 \cap V\text{”}$, a contradiction. Because $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ is at least ω_2 , we may take $\langle \dot{\alpha}_n : n \in \omega \rangle \in M^{P_\eta}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}\{\dot{\alpha}_n : n \in \omega\} \text{ is a subset of } \check{X} \text{ which is cofinal in } \check{\kappa}, \text{ and furthermore } \check{X} \cap \dot{\alpha}_n \text{ is unbounded in } \dot{\alpha}_n \text{ for every } n \in \omega\text{”}$. Notice that for every $p' \in P_\eta$ and ζ such that $p' \Vdash \text{“}\dot{\alpha}_n = \check{\zeta}\text{”}$ we have that $(\forall \gamma < \zeta)(\forall q' \in P_\gamma)(q' \restriction \eta \leq p' \text{ implies } q' \Vdash \text{“cf}(\zeta) \geq \omega_1\text{”})$, because otherwise we would have an element of P_γ which forces that a real exists which is not in the ground model, which we know to be impossible.

Now build $\langle p_n, \tau_n, r_n, \zeta_n, \dot{\alpha}'_n, q_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $p_0 = p$ and $r_0 = p$ and $q_0 = q$ and $\dot{\alpha}'_0 = \zeta_0 = \eta$ and all of the following hold:

- (i) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\zeta_n}} "p_{n+1} \restriction [\zeta_n, \kappa) \Vdash \sigma_n = \check{\tau}_{n+1}"$ and $\tau_{n+1} \in M^{P_{\zeta_n}}$ and $p_{n+1} \leq p_n$ and $p_{n+1} \in M$ and $p_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_n = r_n \restriction \zeta_n$
- (ii) $r_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_n \Vdash \text{"supt}(p_{n+1} \restriction [\zeta_n, \zeta_{n+1}) \Vdash \text{"supt}(p_{n+1} \restriction [\zeta_{n+1}, \dot{\alpha}'_n) = \emptyset"}$ and $\zeta_{n+1} \in M$ and $\text{cf}(\zeta_{n+1}) = \omega_1$ and $r_{n+1} \leq p_{n+1}$ and $r_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_n = p_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_n$ and $r_{n+1} \in M$
- (iii) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\zeta_n}} "\dot{\alpha}'_{n+1} = \max(\dot{\alpha}_{n+1}, \check{\zeta}_{n+1})"$ and $\dot{\alpha}'_{n+1} \in M^{P_{\zeta_n}}$
- (iv) $q_{n+1} \leq r_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_{n+1}$ and $q_{n+1} \restriction \zeta_n = q_n$ and q_{n+1} is (M, μ) -pseudo-complete

Now let $\zeta = \bigcup \{\zeta_n : n \in \omega\}$. Define $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $r \restriction \zeta_n = q_n$ for every $n \in \omega$ and $r \restriction \beta \Vdash "r(\beta) = p_n(\beta) \text{ if } \max(\zeta, \dot{\alpha}'_n \leq \beta < \dot{\alpha}'_{n+1}."$ Then r is as required.

The theorem is established.

We now investigate applications of theorem 9. It is easy to see that if μ^* is a cardinal and P is μ -pseudo-complete and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P "\mu^*$ is measurable and $\dot{Q}$ is Prikry forcing on μ^* " then $\dot{Q}$ is μ -pseudo-complete relative to P for every $\mu < \mu^*$. It is also straightforward to show that if CH holds and P is 2-pseudo-complete and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P "\dot{Q}$ is Namba forcing," then $\dot{Q}$ is 2-pseudo-complete relative to P (just follow the usual proof that Namba forcing adds no reals, keeping track of which objects are in M ; see, e.g., [J, pp. 289–291]). Also, if CH holds and P is ω -pseudo-complete and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P "\dot{Q}$ is the poset of closed countable subsets of a stationary $S^* \subseteq S_0^2$," then $\dot{Q}$ is ω -pseudo-complete relative to P .

One may ask whether having two different versions of revised countable support iteration is actually necessary. It is not hard to show that [S 2, theorem 3] does not hold for RCS^* , and hence it appears unlikely that the RCS^* iteration of semi-proper forcings is semi-proper. Hence we cannot abandon RCS in favor of RCS^* . In the converse direction, Shelah proves that the RCS iteration of the three posets with which we are concerned do not add reals, but only by invoking an extra assumption; roughly, that certain σ -closed cardinal collapses are interspersed throughout the course of the iteration. It is problematic whether this assumption can be removed under RCS . Therefore, it may indeed be necessary to have two versions of revised countable support, depending on what sort of preservation is required (especially preservation of semi-properness versus preservation of not adding reals).

To do:

(1) Exposition of the rest of [Sh, chapter XI] – i.e., deriving solution to Friedman’s problem, Avraham’s problem, and the precipitous filter problem from theorem 9

(2) Show that if $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ is an RCS^* iteration (is uniformness necessary?) and P_κ has λ -c.c. and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa} “|A| < \lambda”$ then $(\exists \alpha < \kappa)(A \in V^{P_\alpha})$. Note that it suffices to establish that the “Kunen axioms” hold for RCS^* , similarly to the last section of [S 2].

(3) Show that if each $\dot{Q}_\eta$ is proper then RCS^* is “the same” as countable support, similar to the penultimate section of [S 2].

(4) Assuming (3) is correct, combine the ideas of [S, theorem 36] and

theorem 9 to obtain preservation of “weakly 2-pseudo-complete plus $< \omega_1$ -proper” under (uniform?) countable support iteration; check whether this can replace “ $\mathcal{D}$ -completeness for some 2-complete completeness system $\mathcal{D}$ ” in each of the applications found in [Sh, chapter VIII], using the ideas of [S, theorem 62] for each relevant poset.

References

- [B] Baumgartner, J., “Iterated Forcing” in *Surveys in Set Theory*, A.R.D. Mathias (ed.), Cambridge University Press, 1979
- [J] Jech, T., *Set Theory*, Academic Press, 1978
- [S] Schlindwein, C., “Consistency of Suslin’s hypothesis, a non-special Aronszajn tree, and GCH,” *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. **59**, pp. 1–29, 1994
- [S 2] Schlindwein, C., “Simplified RCS iterations,” *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, vol. **32**, pp. 341–349, 1993
- [Sh] Shelah, S., *Proper Forcing*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **940**, Springer-Verlag, 1982